

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Final Office Action dated February 23, 2006, and the Advisory Action dated June 12, 2007 have been received and their contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-4, and 9-13 are rejected. With this response, claim 1 has been amended. Claims 1-4 and 9-13 remain pending in this application with claims 5-8 and 14-16 having previously been withdrawn.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner indicates that Applicants' Amendment of May 21, 2007 was not entered because the amendment to Figure 7 raises the issue of new matter. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment to FIG. 7 filed with Applicants' Response dated May 21, 2007 is supported by Applicants' specification as filed, and does not introduce new matter, and respectfully request entry of the May 21, 2007 Amendment.

Applicants note that FIG. 9 of the drawings shows a metal pattern 301 completely overlapping each of the two visible sides of the sealant 310 at two edges of an LCD panel substrate. FIG. 9 does not explicitly show an overlap of the metal pattern with the two other sides of sealant 310, as those sides are not visible in FIG. 9. Paragraph [0057] of the specification as filed, describing "A method for manufacturing the IPS mode LCD device using the UV-hardening sealant according to the second embodiment of the present invention" states, "... the metal pattern 301 are formed of the same metal, and the metal pattern 301 corresponds to the UV-hardening sealant 310." On the other hand, while the metal layer is not explicitly shown in FIG. 7 as filed, the sealant is clearly shown in FIG. 7 (as filed) adjacent to four edges of the second substrate. Applicants submit that the amendment to FIG. 7 to show the metal pattern corresponding to the sealant 310 using hidden lines on the sides not visible in FIG. 9, in view of at least the portions of specification cited above, does not constitute new matter. Accordingly,

Applicants respectfully request entry of the Amendment to the Drawings provided with Applicant's Response filed on May 21, 2007.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4 and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the Office Action points to the limitation "wherein the metal pattern completely overlaps the UV-hardening sealant and is formed at four edges of the first substrate" recited in claims 1 and 9. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection to the claims and request reconsideration. Applicants submit that support for the claims as currently amended with this response can be found in at least FIG. 9, and paragraphs [0053]-[0057] of Applicants' specification as filed.

As discussed above, Applicants' specification indicates that "the metal pattern 301 corresponds to the UV-hardening sealant 310" in at least paragraph [0057]. Applicant additionally notes that the sealant 310 is shown as disposed on the first substrate at all four sides of the periphery of the active area of the first substrate in FIG. 7. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 9 are fully described as required in 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, and Applicant's respectfully request that the rejection to the claims 1-4 and 9-13 be withdrawn.

The Specification is objected to as allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter and for reasons as noted at page 4 of the Office Action. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to remove the recitation cited by the Examiner. Applicants submit that discussed above, at least FIGs. 7 and 9 of Applicants' drawings, and the text of paragraphs [0053]-[0057] of the Applicants' specification as filed fully describe and provide antecedent bases for the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection to the Specification be withdrawn.



The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) as allegedly not showing every feature of the claims and for the reasons as noted at page 3 of the Office Action. FIG. 7 has been amended to explicitly show the relationship between the metal pattern and the sealant on the second substrate as described above. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: August 23, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Eric J. Nuss

Registration No. 40,106

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicants